

U.S. Serial No. 10/780,452

Response dated: August 31, 2011

Supplemental Response to Office Action dated: April 11, 2011

REMARKS

Claims 14, 17-19, 21-24, 28, 31, 35-37 and 39-41 are pending in the present application.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Azpuru at the interview held on July 28, 2011, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview.

By this Amendment, claims 14 and 28 are amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions that were discussed during the July 28 interview to place this application in even better condition for allowance. Claims 27 and 34 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed (see page 10, lines 5-13; and original claims 11 and 27).
No new matter is added.

The Remarks submitted July 11, 2011 should be read in conjunction with the above claims. Moreover, U.S. Patent No. 7,056,591 to Pacetti et al. ("Pacetti") would not have rendered obvious a delivery vehicle or composition wherein the Pemirolast or analog thereof is present in an amount of from about

U.S. Serial No. 10/780,452

Response dated: August 31, 2011

Supplemental Response to Office Action dated: April 11, 2011

0.01 milligram Pemirolast or analog thereof per kilogram of the body to about 3,000 milligram Pemirolast or analog thereof per kilogram of the body, as recited in claims 14 and 28. As discussed during the interview, Pacetti is silent as to the amount of coating for its medical device.

Pacetti further provides no reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the coating of Pacetti in a manner necessary to have been applied to (or coated upon) the delivery vehicles as recited in claims 14 and 28. More specifically, Pacetti is silent as to any one of microcapsules, microspheres, barriers, liposomes, fibers, filaments, gels, foams and films in conjunction with its described coating, as discussed during the interview. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Pacetti fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the present claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt notification of allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2478 (14758).

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited

U.S. Serial No. 10/780,452

Response dated: August 31, 2011

Supplemental Response to Office Action dated: April 11, 2011

to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2011

/Michael J. Mlotkowski/

Michael J. Mlotkowski
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,020
(703) 584-3270

POST OFFICE ADDRESS to which
Correspondence is to be sent:

Roberts, Mlotkowski, Safran & Cole
P.O. Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102-8064